

Polynomial solutions of differential-difference equations

Diego Dominici

Department of Mathematics

State University of New York at New Paltz

1 Hawk Dr. Suite 9

New Paltz, NY 12561-2443

USA

dominid@newpaltz.edu.

Kathy Driver

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics

University of Cape Town

Private Bag X3, Rondebosch 7701

Cape Town

South Africa

kathy.driver@uct.ac.za.

Kerstin Jordaan

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics

University of Pretoria

Pretoria, 0002

South Africa

kjordaan@up.ac.za

January 31, 2009

Abstract

We investigate the zeros of polynomial solutions to the differential-difference equation

$$P_{n+1}(x) = A_n(x)P'_n(x) + B_n(x)P_n(x), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

where A_n and B_n are polynomials of degree at most 2 and 1 respectively. We address the question of when the zeros are real and simple and whether the zeros of polynomials of adjacent degree are interlacing. Our result holds for general classes of polynomials but includes sequences of classical orthogonal polynomials as well as Euler-Frobenius, Bell and other polynomials.

AMS MOS Classification: 33C45, 42C05

Keywords: Interlacing properties; Zeros.

1 Introduction

Let $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be the sequence of polynomials defined by

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(x) &= 1 \\ P_{n+1}(x) &= A_n(x)P'_n(x) + B_n(x)P_n(x), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ are polynomials in x of degree at most 2 and 1 respectively. The best-known families of classical orthogonal polynomials satisfy differential-difference equations of this type:

- Jacobi polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+1}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) &= \frac{(2n+2+\alpha+\beta)(x^2-1)}{2(n+1)(n+1+\alpha+\beta)} \frac{d}{dx} P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{(2n+2+\alpha+\beta)x + \alpha - \beta}{2(n+1)} P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

- Laguerre polynomials

$$L_{n+1}^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{x}{n+1} \frac{d}{dx} L_n^{(\alpha)}(x) + \frac{\alpha + n + 1 - x}{n+1} L_n^{(\alpha)}(x).$$

- Hermite polynomials

$$H_{n+1}(x) = -\frac{d}{dx}H_n(x) + 2xH_n(x).$$

In these cases, it follows from the theory of orthogonal polynomials [9] that the zeros of $P_n(x)$ are real and simple and that the zeros of $P_{n+1}(x)$ and $P_n(x)$ are interlacing. This leads to the question of what can one say about the zeros of a sequence of polynomials satisfying (1) which is not orthogonal. Examples of such sequences include the Bell polynomials [1], the Euler-Frobenius polynomials [5] and the so-called derivative polynomials [6].

A number of authors have investigated the properties of the zeros of sequences of polynomials that are solutions of (1) but are not, in general, orthogonal. In [10], Vertgeim considered polynomials generated by (1) with

$$A_n(x) = a_n x^2 - b_n, \quad B_n(x) = \alpha a_n x, \quad \alpha, a_n, b_n > 0,$$

that generalize the Euler polynomials. In [3], [4], Dubeau and Savoie study interlacing properties of the zeros of polynomial solutions of (1) with

$$A_n(x) = \kappa_n (1 - x^2), \quad B_n(x) = -2\kappa_n r_n x, \quad r_n > 0, \kappa_n \neq 0,$$

which contain the generalized Euler-Frobenius and the ultraspherical polynomials as special cases. They also consider the Hermite-like polynomials defined by (1) with

$$A_n(x) = \kappa_n, \quad B_n(x) = -2\kappa_n x, \quad \kappa_n \neq 0.$$

In [8], Liu and Wang analyze polynomial solutions of the equation

$$P_{n+1}(x) = A_n(x)P'_n(x) + B_n(x)P_n(x) + C_n(x)P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2)$$

By assuming that $P_n(x)$ has strictly nonnegative coefficients (respectively alternating in sign) and $A_n(x) < 0$ or $C_n(x) < 0$ for $x \leq 0$ (respectively $x \geq 0$), they show that $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ forms a Sturm sequence. Although (2) is more general than (1), the conditions on the sign of the coefficients of $P_n(x)$ is a priori very difficult to check, except in rather isolated situations.

In this paper, we shall take an approach similar to that used in [10]. We establish criteria that ensure, for a sequence of polynomials $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfying (1), either that all zeros of P_n are real and simple, or the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} are interlacing, or both, based on conditions that can be checked directly from A_n and B_n . We present several interesting examples and consider possible extensions.

2 Preliminary results

It is obvious that any sequence of polynomials is a solution of (1), if we allow $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ to be (non unique) rational functions of x . The question of characterizing which sequences of polynomials $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are solutions of (1), when $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ are polynomials in x , is addressed in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that $P_n(x)$ is a polynomial with n simple zeros. Let*

$$P_n(x_{n,k}) = 0, \quad y_{n,k} = \frac{P_{n+1}(x_{n,k})}{P'_n(x_{n,k})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

Then the following are equivalent:

- i) *There exist polynomials $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ of degree at most 2 and 1 respectively such that $\{P_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfies (1). For every $n \geq 3$, $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ are unique.*
- ii) *For every $n \geq 2$, there exists a quadratic polynomial $A_n(x)$ such that*

$$A_n(x_{n,k}) = y_{n,k}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Evaluating (1) at the zeros of $P_n(x)$, we clearly see that i) $\implies$ ii). Assume now that ii) holds. For $n = 0$, we have

$$P_1(x) = A_0(x)P'_0(x) + B_0(x)P_0(x) = B_0(x),$$

since $P_0(x) = 1$. Thus, $A_0(x)$ can be any polynomial of degree at most 2 and $B_0(x) = P_1(x)$. For $n = 1$, let $B_1(x)$ be an arbitrary polynomial of degree at most 1 and define $A_1(x)$ by

$$A_1(x) = \frac{P_2(x) - B_1(x)P_1(x)}{P'_1(x)}.$$

Since $P'_1(x)$ is a non-zero constant, we see that i) holds for $n = 1$. For $n \geq 2$, let $A_n(x)$ be a quadratic polynomial such that

$$y_{n,k} = A_n(x_{n,k}), \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then $P_{n+1}(x) - A_n(x)P'_n(x)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n + 1$ that is zero at each $x_{n,k}$ and therefore divisible by $P_n(x)$. This yields the existence of a B_n that is at most linear. When $n \geq 3$, A_n is uniquely determined so that i) holds. ■

Remark 2 *The assumption that $P_n(x)$ has n simple zeros is not very restrictive in the sense that the statement and proof of Theorem 1 can be modified to cater for this possibility.*

Example 3 *Let $P_n(x)$ be the family of orthonormal polynomials with respect to the Freud-type weight*

$$w(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \frac{1}{K_{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{t^2}{2}\right)} \exp\left(-x^4 + 2tx^2 - \frac{t^2}{4}\right),$$

where $K_\nu(z)$ is the Bessel function of the second kind. In this case, we have [7]

$$A_n(x) = -\frac{1}{4a_{n+1}(x^2 + a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 - t)}, \quad B_n(x) = \frac{x(x^2 + a_{n+1}^2 - t)}{a_{n+1}(x^2 + a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 - t)},$$

where the numbers a_n are the coefficients in the three-term recurrence relation

$$xP_n(x) = a_{n+1}P_{n+1}(x) + a_nP_{n-1}(x)$$

satisfying the string equation

$$n = 4a_n^2(a_{n+1}^2 + a_n^2 + a_{n-1}^2 - t), \quad n \geq 0.$$

The initial values for a_n are

$$a_0 = 0, \quad a_1(t) = \sqrt{\frac{t}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{K_{\frac{1}{4}}\left(\frac{t^2}{4}\right)}{K_{\frac{3}{4}}\left(\frac{t^2}{4}\right)} - 1}, \quad a_1(0) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}\sqrt{\pi}}, \quad (4)$$

where $a_1 > 0$ is chosen so that $P_1(x) = \frac{x}{a_1}$ has unit norm.

For $n = 5$, we have

$$P_5(x) = \frac{x^5 - \alpha x^3 + \beta x}{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_5},$$

with

$$\alpha = a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + a_4^2, \quad \beta = a_1^2 a_3^2 + a_1^2 a_4^2 + a_2^2 a_4^2$$

and therefore, with the notation of (3),

$$x_{5,1} = 0, \quad x_{5,2} = \sqrt{\zeta_+}, \quad x_{5,3} = -\sqrt{\zeta_+}, \quad x_{5,4} = \sqrt{\zeta_-}, \quad x_{5,5} = -\sqrt{\zeta_-}$$

$$\zeta_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 4\beta} \right).$$

One can show, using a simple algebraic argument, that the polynomial interpolating the points $(x_{5,k}, y_{5,k})$, $1 \leq k \leq 5$ has degree 4, unless $a_1 = 0$, which contradicts (4). We deduce from Theorem 1 that there are no polynomials $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ such that $P_n(x)$ satisfies (1).

3 Main result

In our proofs, we will find it convenient to re-write the differential-difference equation (1) in the form

$$P_{n+1}(x) = \frac{A_n(x)}{K_n(x)} \frac{d}{dx} [K_n(x) P_n(x)], \quad (5)$$

where $K_n(x)$ is an "integrating factor", defined by

$$K_n(x) = \exp \left(\int^x \frac{B_n(t)}{A_n(t)} dt \right). \quad (6)$$

Since $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$ are polynomials, we can obtain all possible functions $K_n(x)$ by considering the location of the zeros of $A_n(x)$ and $B_n(x)$. This leads to the following classification, where we define the extended real line by $(-\infty, \infty) \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and the notation $f(\pm\infty) = 0$ means $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) = 0$.

Theorem 4 *Let $K_n(x)$ be defined by (6). Then, $K_n(x)$ has at most 2 zeros on the extended real line.*

Proof. Since $K_n(x)$ depends on the ratio $B_n(x)/A_n(x)$, without loss of generality, we can choose $A_n(x)$ to be monic. We consider the possible cases in turn.

1. Let $A_n(x) = (x - \lambda_n)(x - \xi_n)$, $\deg(B_0) = 1$ and $B_n(x) = \mu_n$, $\mu_n \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$. If $\lambda_n \neq \xi_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = \exp \left[\frac{\mu_n}{\lambda_n - \xi_n} \ln \left(\frac{x - \lambda_n}{x - \xi_n} \right) \right].$$

If $\xi_n = \lambda_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = \exp \left(-\frac{\mu_n}{x - \lambda_n} \right).$$

2. Let $A_n(x) = (x - \lambda_n)(x - \xi_n)$, and $B_n(x) = \kappa_n(x - \mu_n)$, $\kappa_n \neq 0$. If $\xi_n \neq \lambda_n \neq \mu_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = \exp \left[\kappa_n \frac{\lambda_n - \mu_n}{\lambda_n - \xi_n} \ln(x - \lambda_n) + \kappa_n \frac{\mu_n - \xi_n}{\lambda_n - \xi_n} \ln(x - \xi_n) \right].$$

If $\xi_n = \lambda_n \neq \mu_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = (x - \lambda_n)^{\kappa_n} \exp \left(\kappa_n \frac{\mu_n - \lambda_n}{x - \lambda_n} \right).$$

If $\xi_n \neq \lambda_n = \mu_n$ or $\xi_n = \lambda_n = \mu_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = (x - \xi_n)^{\kappa_n}.$$

3. Let $A_n(x) = x - \lambda_n$, and $B_n(x) = \kappa_n(x - \mu_n)$, $\kappa_n \neq 0$. If $\lambda_n \neq \mu_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = \exp [\kappa_n x + \kappa_n (\lambda_n - \mu_n) \ln(x - \lambda_n)].$$

If $\lambda_n = \mu_n$, we have

$$K_n(x) = \exp(\kappa_n x).$$

4. Let $A_n(x) = 1$, and $B_n(x) = \kappa_n(x - \mu_n)$, $\kappa_n \neq 0$. We have

$$K_n(x) = \exp \left[\kappa_n x \left(\frac{x}{2} - \mu_n \right) \right].$$

■

We are now ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 5 *We denote the zeros of $P_n(x)$ in increasing order by $\gamma_{i,n}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let*

$$-\infty \leq \alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n < \beta_n \leq \beta_{n+1} \leq \infty$$

and $K_n(x)$ be continuous on $[\alpha_n, \beta_n]$ and differentiable on (α_n, β_n) . Then,

- (a) *If $K_n(x) = 0$ only at $x = \alpha_n$ and $x = \beta_n$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$ and $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$, then the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} interlace and are in the interval (α_n, β_n) for $1 \leq n \leq N$.*

- (b) If $K_n(x) = 0$ only when $x = \alpha_n$ (respectively β_n), $\frac{A_n(x)}{K_n(x)} = 0$ when $x = \beta_n$ (respectively α_n), $\beta_n < \beta_{n+1}$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$ (respectively $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$) and $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$, then the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} interlace and are in the interval (α_n, β_n) for $1 \leq n \leq N$.
- (c) If $K_n(x) = 0$ only when $x = \alpha_n$ (respectively β_n), $\frac{A_n(x)}{K_n(x)} = 0$ when $x = \beta_n$ (respectively α_n) for $1 \leq n \leq N$ and $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} \leq \beta_1$ (respectively $\alpha_1 \leq \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$), then all the zeros of P_n are real, simple and in the interval $(\alpha_n, \beta_n]$ (respectively $[\alpha_n, \beta_n)$) for $1 \leq n \leq N$.
- (d) If $K_n(x) \neq 0$, $\frac{A_n(x)}{K_n(x)} = 0$ when $x = \alpha_n, \beta_n$ and $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n < \beta_n < \beta_{n+1}$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$ with $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$, then the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} interlace for $1 \leq n \leq N$.

Proof. We use the familiar extension of Rolle's theorem to an infinite open interval.

- (a) When $n = 1$ we have $P_2(x) = \frac{A_1(x)}{K_1(x)} \frac{d}{dx}[K_1(x)P_1(x)]$ and $K_1(x)P_1(x) = 0$ at α_1, β_1 and $\gamma_{1,1}$ with $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$. It follows from Rolle's theorem that $P_2(x) = 0$ at $\gamma_{1,2}, \gamma_{2,2}$ with

$$\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{1,1} < \gamma_{2,2} < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2.$$

Now, let $2 \leq n \leq N$ and assume that we have proved the result for $P_n(x)$. Since $K_n(x)P_n(x)$ vanishes at α_n, β_n and $\gamma_{i,n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $\alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} < \beta_n$, Rolle's theorem applied to (5) yields

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} < \gamma_{n+1,n+1} < \beta_n \leq \beta_{n+1}$$

and the result follows.

- (b) We prove the result for $\frac{A_n}{K_n}(\beta_n) = 0$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, the other case being analogous. When $n = 1$ we have $P_2(x) = \frac{A_1(x)}{K_1(x)} \frac{d}{dx}[K_1(x)P_1(x)]$ and $K_1(x)P_1(x) = 0$ at α_1 and $\gamma_{1,1}$ with $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} < \beta_1$ and it follows from Rolle's theorem that $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{1,1}$. The second zero of P_2 coincides with β_1 , so we have

$$\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{1,1} < \gamma_{2,2} = \beta_1 < \beta_2.$$

Now, let $2 \leq n \leq N$ and assume that we have proved the result for $P_n(x)$. Since $K_n(x)P_n(x)$ vanishes at α_n and $\gamma_{i,n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $\alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} < \beta_n$, Rolle's theorem applied to (5) yields

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n}.$$

Since the largest zero of P_{n+1} coincides with β_n we have

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} < \gamma_{n+1,n+1} = \beta_n < \beta_{n+1}$$

and the result follows.

- (c) We prove the result for $\frac{A_n}{K_n}(\beta_n) = 0$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$, the other case being analogous. When $n = 1$ we have $P_2(x) = \frac{A_1(x)}{K_1(x)} \frac{d}{dx}[K_1(x)P_1(x)]$ and $K_1(x)P_1(x) = 0$ at α_1 and $\gamma_{1,1}$ with $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,1} \leq \beta_1$ and it follows from Rolle's theorem that $\alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{1,1}$. The second zero of P_2 coincides with β_1 , so we have

$$\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1 < \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{1,1} \leq \gamma_{2,2} = \beta_1 \leq \beta_2.$$

Now, let $2 \leq n \leq N$ and assume that we have proved the result for $P_n(x)$. Since $K_n(x)P_n(x)$ vanishes at α_n and $\gamma_{i,n}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $\alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} \leq \beta_n$, Rolle's theorem applied to (5) yields

$$\alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n-1,n} < \gamma_{n,n+1} < \gamma_{n,n}.$$

The largest zero of P_{n+1} coincides with β_n , so we have

$$\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n < \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \dots < \gamma_{n,n} \leq \gamma_{n+1,n+1} = \beta_n \leq \beta_{n+1}$$

and the result follows.

- (d) When $n = 1$ we have $P_2(x) = \frac{A_1(x)}{K_1(x)} \frac{d}{dx}[K_1(x)P_1(x)]$ and $P_2(x) = 0$ at α_1 and β_1 with $\alpha_1 = \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{2,2} = \beta_1$. When $n = 2$, $\gamma_{1,3} = \beta_2$ and $\gamma_{3,3} = \beta_2$. Furthermore, $P_3(x) = \frac{A_2(x)}{K_2(x)} \frac{d}{dx}[K_2(x)P_2(x)]$ and Rolle's theorem implies that $\alpha_1 = \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{2,2} = \beta_1$. Hence

$$\alpha_2 = \gamma_{1,3} < \alpha_1 = \gamma_{1,2} < \gamma_{2,3} < \gamma_{2,2} = \beta_1 < \gamma_{3,3} = \beta_2.$$

Now, let $3 \leq n \leq N$ and assume that we have proved the result for $P_n(x)$. The smallest and largest zero of P_{n+1} is $\gamma_{1,n+1} = \alpha_n$ and

$\gamma_{n+1,n+1} = \beta_n$. The remaining $n - 1$ zeros are obtained by applying Rolle's theorem to the function inside the square brackets in (5)

$$\alpha_n = \gamma_{1,n+1} < \gamma_{1,n} < \gamma_{2,n+1} < \cdots < \gamma_{n,n+1} < \gamma_{n,n} < \gamma_{n+1,n+1} = \beta_n.$$

■

4 Examples

We conclude by giving some examples where our results apply, highlighting particular choices of A_n and B_n that give rise to known families of polynomials.

Example 6 *Let*

$$A_n(x) = \kappa_n (1 - x^2), \quad B_n(x) = -2\kappa_n r_n x, \quad r_n > 0, \kappa_n \neq 0.$$

Then

$$K_n(x) = (x^2 - 1)^{r_n}$$

and Theorem 5 (a) applies. In [3], [4], the authors obtain the same result using a different approach.

Example 7 *The Bell polynomials $\mathfrak{B}_n(x)$ are defined by*

$$\mathfrak{B}_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n S_k^n x^k, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where S_k^n is the Stirling number of the second kind. They satisfy the differential-difference equation

$$\mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(x) = x [\mathfrak{B}'_n(x) + \mathfrak{B}_n(x)],$$

from which we obtain

$$A_n(x) = x, \quad K_n(x) = e^x.$$

In this case, we have $\alpha_n = -\infty$ and $\beta_n = 0$ and from Theorem 5 (c) it follows that the zeros of $\mathfrak{B}_n(x)$ are real and simple and lie in the interval $(-\infty, 0]$.

Example 8 Let $P_n(x)$ be the family of polynomials defined by

$$P_n(x) = (c)_n {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, & b \\ c & \end{matrix} \middle| x \right).$$

In this case, we have

$$A_n(x) = x(1-x), \quad B_n(x) = n+c-bx$$

and thus

$$K_n(x) = x^{n+c}(x-1)^{b-c-n}.$$

Provided that $n \in (-c, b-c)$, it follows from Theorem 5 (a) that the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} are interlacing and lie in the interval $(0, 1)$. The same result is obtained in [2] using a different technique.

Acknowledgement 9 The work of D. Dominici was supported by a Humboldt Research Fellowship for experienced researchers provided by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. The work of K. Driver was supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa under grant number 2053730. The work of K. Jordaan was supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa under grant number 2054423.

References

- [1] L. Carlitz. Single variable Bell polynomials. *Collect. Math.*, 14:13–25, 1962.
- [2] K. Driver and K. Jordaan. Separation theorems for the zeros of certain hypergeometric polynomials. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 199(1):48–55, 2007.
- [3] F. Dubeau and J. Savoie. On interlacing properties of the roots of orthogonal and Euler-Frobenius polynomials. In *Approximation theory VIII, Vol. 1 (College Station, TX, 1995)*, volume 6 of *Ser. Approx. Decompos.*, pages 185–191. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [4] F. Dubeau and J. Savoie. On the roots of orthogonal polynomials and Euler-Frobenius polynomials. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 196(1):84–98, 1995.

- [5] F. G. Frobenius. Über die Bernoullischen Zahlen und die Eulerischen Polynome. *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 809–847, 1910.
- [6] M. E. Hoffman. Derivative polynomials for tangent and secant. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 102(1):23–30, 1995.
- [7] M. E. H. Ismail. *Classical and quantum orthogonal polynomials in one variable*, volume 98 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [8] L. L. Liu and Y. Wang. A unified approach to polynomial sequences with only real zeros. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 38(4):542–560, 2007.
- [9] G. Szegő. *Orthogonal polynomials*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., fourth edition, 1975.
- [10] B. A. Vertgeim. Euler polynomials and their generalization. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 33(2):164–167, 222, 1992.